

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-15, 25, 27, 32-34, 66-68 and 70-72 are pending in this application. Applicants thank the Examiner for determining that claim 72 is allowable. Claims 10, 27, 32-34, 68, 70 and 71 stand rejected. Claims 11-15, 25, 66 and 67 stand objected to. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 11-15, 25, 27, 32-34, 66-68, and 70-72 are presented for consideration.

According to the Examiner, the instant claims will be given the effective priority date of April 17, 1997.

**I. Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 10, 27, 32-34, 68, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Juretic et al (*Int J of Cancer*, November 15, 1996, Vol. 68, pp. 471-478).

The Examiner asserts that Juretic et al. disclose the peptide VGAVGVGKS which meets the limitations of claim 10 requiring a nine-mer from the motif set forth in claim 10.

Applicants traverse this rejection. However, in further response, Applicants herewith cancel claim 10 and revise the claims to depend from claims directed to subject matter that, according to the Examiner, is allowable.

The Examiner further rejects Claims 10, 27, 32, 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gedde-Dahl et al. (*European Journal of Immunology*, 1993, 23(3):754-760).

The Examiner states that Gedde-Dahl et al. disclose the peptide GAAGVGKSALAL (page 756, Figure 2) which meets the specific limitation of eliciting a mutant ras-peptide specific human CD+8 CTL immune response because human PBMC were used as APC.

Applicants traverse this rejection. However, in further response, Applicants herewith cancel claim 10 and revise the claims to depend from claims directed to subject matter that, according to the Examiner, is allowable. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner states that the subject matter of Claim 72 is allowable. The Examiner further asserts that claims 11-15, 25, 66 and 67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of this indication of allowable subject matter, Applicants have amended claims 11-15 to recite all the limitations of claim 10 plus the limitations in the previously presented claims. Applicants also have amended claims 25, 66 and 67 to recite the limitations of allowable claim 72. Thus, all of these amended claims should be in condition for allowance. However, Applicants assert that by the same logic, all claims that depend from these amended claims also should be in condition for allowance. That is, claim 27 has been amended to depend from claim 72 and should be allowable. Claims 32 has been amended to depend from claim 72 and claims 33, 34, 68, 70 and 71 depend directly or indirectly from claim 32. Therefore, all of these claims should be allowable. The amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter. Entry thereof and an indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and comments, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections and objections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance should be issued in this application. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2007

**Customer No. 44991**  
Heller Ehrman LLP  
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036-3001  
Telephone: (202) 912-2000  
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020

Patricia D. Granados

Patricia D. Granados  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 33,683

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-1641 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.